DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 692 CS 510 218

AUTHOR Martin, Matthew M.; Mottet, Timothy P.; Myers, Scott A.
TITLE The Relationships between Students' Motives for Communicating with Their Instructors and Affective and Cognitive Learning.
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 30p.; See CS 510 217 and EJ 581 443 for related documents.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Communication; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; *Motivation; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Student Relationship; Undergraduate Students; Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Behavior

ABSTRACT

Recently, Martin, Myers, and Mottet (1999) introduced a measure for the motives students have for communicating with their instructors. The purpose of this study was to further examine students' motives for communicating in the classroom and to further refine this measure. Additionally, measures of affective and cognitive learning were used to establish validity for the new measure. The five motives students use to communicate with their instructors were relational, functional, excuse, participation, and sycophancy. Subjects were 259 students enrolled in introductory communication courses. Analyses resulted in a revised 30-item, five factor (six items per factor) measure. The motives of relate, functional, and participation tended to be positively correlated with learning while there were no significant relationships between excuse and sycophancy with learning. Contains 76 references and 2 tables of data. (Author/RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 437 692

Running Head: Motives

The Relationships Between Students' Motives for Communicating With Their Instructors and Affective and Cognitive Learning

Matthew M. Martin
West Virginia University

Timothy P. Mottet
Southwest Texas State University

Scott A. Myers
Creighton University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. Mottet
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Matthew M. Martin (Ph.D., Kent State University, 1992) is an Associate Professor, Communication Studies Department, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV, 26506, (304-293-3905), MMARTIN@WVU.EDU. Timothy P. Mottet (Ed.D., West Virginia University, 1998) is an Assistant Professor, Department of Speech Communication, Southwest Texas State University. Scott A. Myers (Ph.D., Kent State University, 1995) is an Assistant Professor, Department of Communication Studies, Creighton University.

CS 510 218

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Recently, Martin, Myers, and Mottet (1999) introduced a measure for the motives students have for communicating with their instructors. The purpose of this study was to further examine students' motives for communicating in the classroom and to further refine this measure. Additionally, measures of affective and cognitive learning were used to establish validity for the new measure. The five motives students use to communicate with their instructors were relational, functional, excuse, participation, and sycophancy. Analyses resulted in a revised 30-item, five factor (six items per factor) measure. The motives of relate, functional, and participation tended to be positively correlated with learning, while there were no significant relationships between excuse and sycophancy with learning.

The Relationships Between Students' Motives for Communicating With Their Instructors and Affective and Cognitive Learning

While instructional research has recognized the importance of studying communication in the classroom, most attention has been paid to how instructors communicate with their students. Instructor communication behaviors influence students, for instance, in the areas of affective and cognitive learning (e.g., Christensen & Menzel, 1998; Richmond, 1990; Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987), motivation (e.g., Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Gorham & Christophel, 1992; Gorham & Millette, 1997), empowerment (e.g., Frymier, Shulman, & Houser, 1996), and involvement in classroom interaction (e.g., Booth-Butterfield, Moller, & Mollish, 1992).

The process-product paradigm continues to dominate educational research. According to Shulman (1986), "the process-product tradition studies the relationships of teaching performance and subsequent student capacities" (p. 8). And while Nussbaum (1992) acknowledges the contributions the paradigm has made to teacher effectiveness research, he encouraged researchers to pull away from examining teaching as a static and linear process. According to Nussbaum, "researchers continue to look for the 'golden cause' of student achievement as if there exists one teacher behavior that, if performed, will 'cure' bad teaching. The circular nature of teacher-student interaction has not entered into the research" (p. 178).

The influence of the process-product paradigm is evidenced in the paucity of research that has examined the communication behaviors of students and subsequent outcomes. This is surprising, given that student communication behaviors affect classroom climate and the development of student-instructor relationships. Instructors' perceptions of students' nonverbal responsiveness has been shown to be positively related to instructors' perceptions of their students, teaching effectiveness, teaching satisfaction, and quality of instructor-student

interpersonal relationships (Mottet, 1998). Furthermore, because students' relationships with their instructors are related to instructor evaluations (Cooper, Stewart, & Gudykunst, 1982) and because instructors are aware that increased student-instructor interaction usually results in more favorable evaluations (Wilson, Woods, & Gaff, 1974), it would seem plausible that the study of student communication behaviors, and in particular student motivation to communicate, would be more plentiful.

Research conducted on student motivation to communicate with instructors has been largely confined to the area of student questions. Students ask a variety of questions in the classroom (Good, Slavings, Hard, & Emerson, 1987; Pearson & West, 1991; West & Pearson, 1994), but their tendency to ask questions is hampered if they believe the instructor is unwilling to respond (van der Meij, 1989) or if they think the instructor has already covered the topic (Good, 1981). Students are able to provide instructors with clues that indicate a lack of comprehension (Darling, 1989) by requesting help, requesting additional information, or by checking a point of view (Kendrick, 1987; Kendrick & Darling, 1990). In most cases, students motivation to communicate via asking questions is related to purposes of clarification and inquiring about classroom procedures (Darling, 1989; Pearson & West, 1991; West & Pearson, 1994).

Believing that there may be other reasons why students are motivated to communicate with their instructors, Martin, Myers, and Mottet (1999) investigated this belief. Their research identified five underlying reasons why students communicate with their instructors: relational, functional, excuse, participation, and sycophancy. When students communicate in order to Relate, they are trying to develop personal relationships with their instructors. Communicating for Functional reasons includes learning more about the material and the assignments in the

course. Students also communicate to offer Excuses; attempting to explain why work is late or missing. A fourth reason students give for communication is Participation. Students want to demonstrate to their instructors that they are interested in the class and they understand the material. The fifth reason is to get on the instructor's good side, Sycophancy. Some students report that they communicate in order to make a favorable impression, communicating in a way that they know the instructor will approve.

Martin et al. (1999) found that students who communicated with their instructor more often in general communicated more with their instructors to relate and participate. The students who communicated for the interpersonal communication motive of control tended to communicate more in excuse making, participation, and sycophancy. Students' motivation about school was positively related to the communication reasons of relational, functional, and participation. Additionally, students' belief in an internal locus of control was positively related to the communication reason of functional, while negatively related to the reason of sycophancy (Martin, Myers, & Mottet, 1998). The focus of the current study is to examine the relationships between students' motivations for communicating with their instructors and student learning.

Review of Literature

Interpersonal Communication Motives

Interpersonal communication motives are relatively stable, personal characteristics explaining why people communicate with others and how people communicate to satisfy interpersonal needs (Graham, Barbato, & Perse, 1993). Based on the premise that interpersonal communication is goal directed and extending Schutz' (1966) interpersonal needs research, Rubin, Perse, and Barbato (1988) applied Uses and Gratification Theory from mass communication to the context of interpersonal relationships, identifying six motives: affection,

pleasure, inclusion, relaxation, escape, and control. These motives influence whom we talk to, how we talk to them, what we talk about, our satisfaction in the relationships, and our success in achieving personal goals (Anderson & Martin, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c; Graham et al., 1993; Martin & Anderson, 1995; Rubin, 1993; Rubin et al., 1988).

Previous research has identified relationships that exist between interpersonal communication motives and other communication variables, including communication satisfaction, communication apprehension, and communication competence (Anderson & Martin, 1995a; Hosman, 1981; Kondo, 1994; Myers, 1997; Rubin et al., 1988; Rubin & Martin, 1994). Additional work has looked at the relationships between motives and communication strategies and styles (Graham et al., 1993; Javidi, Jordan, & Carlone, 1994; Martin & Rubin, 1998; Myers, Zhong, & Mitchell, 1995). Attention has also been paid to the study of interpersonal communication motives contextually, including families (Graham et al., 1993; Martin & Anderson, 1995), organizations (Anderson & Martin, 1995c), and small groups (Anderson & Martin, 1995b; Martin & Anderson, 1998). While Rubin and Martin (1998) argued that while people's interpersonal communication motives are trait-like and influence their communication across situations, they also added that people might also have other reasons why they communicate in a given context, such as a classroom. Based on this belief, Martin, Myers, and Mottet (1998) investigated why students at the university level communicate with their instructors. The following sections briefly review student learning.

Student Learning

Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia's (1964) taxonomy of affective learning and Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of cognitive learning have been the dominant conceptualizations of student learning used by instructional communication researchers for over the past two decades (Hurt,

Scott, & McCroskey, 1978; Richmond & McCroskey, 1992). A third domain, behavioral or psychomotor learning, also exists in the educational psychology literature however this domain of learning has received less attention primarily since instructional communication researchers have been working with college samples where course content remains more cognitive than behavioral.

> Affective learning. Krathwohl et al. (1964) defined the affective domain of learning as "the (learning) objectives which emphasize a feeling or tone, an emotion or degree of acceptance or rejection" (p. 7). Affective learning is concerned with students' attitudes, beliefs, and values that relate to the knowledge and psychomotor skills they have acquired (McCroskey, 1992), and occurs when students internalize positive attitudes toward the content or subject matter (Kearney, 1994).

Similar to Bloom's (1956) original conceptualization of cognitive learning, the affective learning domain is arranged in a hierarchy including lower to higher level learning objectives. The lowest level is receiving and this level is characterized by a student's willingness to receive information and selectively attend to information. The second level is responding. Students being willing to respond to new information and being satisfied in their responding characterize this level. The third level is valuing where students demonstrate an acceptance of a value or show a preference for a value. The fourth level is organization. This level deals with the conceptualization of values and their integration into a value system. The fifth, and highest level, is characterized by a complex value. Students internalizing their acquired attitudes, beliefs, and values characterize higher level affective learning. This internalized affective condition becomes habituated and part of the student's operating system and remains consistent with one's "total philosophy or world view" (Krathwohl et al., 1964).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Krathwohl and his associates suggested that all higher levels of cognitive learning have an affective component and that teachers use both cognitive and affective learning goals simultaneously and interchangeably. In short, students use an affective goal as a means of achieving a cognitive one and vice-versa. Research has shown that if students acquire a positive affect toward school and/or a particular subject area, their affect serves not only as a motivational catalyst in achieving higher levels of cognitive learning, but also to self-directed learning (Christophel, 1990; Frymier, 1994; Rodriguez, Plax, & Kearney, 1996). Again, numerous studies have examined the relationships between instructor communication and student affective learning, but little research has examined the relationships between student communication and affective learning.

Cognitive learning. The cognitive domain of learning is concerned with the process of acquiring knowledge. According to Bloom (1956), cognitive learning is demonstrated by knowledge recall and various intellectual skills including comprehending information, organizing ideas, analyzing and synthesizing data, applying knowledge, choosing among alternatives in problem-solving, and evaluating ideas or action. This domain of learning is arranged from lower to higher order cognitive abilities including knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Knowledge refers to the recall and recognition of information. Comprehension refers to description and explanation of information. Application refers to demonstrating and applying information. Analysis refers to analyzing and criticizing information whereas synthesizing refers to arranging and assembling information. Finally, evaluation refers to appraising and judging information.

Measuring cognitive learning, however, has been more problematic. In the past, researchers have measured cognitive learning through student scores obtained on examinations

and quizzes (Andersen, Norton, & Nussbaum, 1981; Comstock, Bowers, & Rowell, 1995; Nussbaum & Scott, 1979, 1980), student reports of grades or grade point averages (Frymier & Houser, 1997), and student reports of examination scores (Frymier & Houser, 1998). However, the prevalent way to measure cognitive learning has been advanced by Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey (1997). They posited that by asking students how much they had learned from an instructor, as well as how much they could have learned from an ideal instructor is a more representative way of operationalizing student cognitive learning.

For two decades, instruction communication researchers have been examining the relationships between teacher communication and student affective and cognitive learning (Nussbaum & Scott, 1979; Richmond & McCroskey, 1992). What remains missing in the research literature is the relationship between students' communicative behavior and subsequent learning. Again, Nussbaum (1992) encourages researchers to examine the education process as a complex phenomenon that is best conceptualized as dynamic, transactional, and mutually influential. Taking Nussbaum's direction, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationships between students' motives for communicating with their instructors and student learning. Specifically, this study examined the following two research questions:

RQ1: What is the relationship between the reasons students give for communicating with their instructors and affective learning?

RQ2: What is the relationship between the reasons students give for communicating with their instructors and cognitive learning?

Method

Participants

Participants were 259 students (131 women, 127 men, 1 did not report sex) enrolled in introductory communication courses at a university in the Midwest. The mean age was 20.09 (SD = 2.84). The mean reported G.P.A. was 3.06 (SD = .65). Participation in this study was voluntary.

Procedure

Students were instructed to complete a questionnaire that dealt with the course and the instructor that they had immediately before the class that they were currently attending. The questionnaire included measures of affective learning, cognitive learning, and motives for communicating with instructors.

Instruments

In the first study involving motives for communicating with instructor, Martin, Myers, and Mottet (1998) presented a 24-item measure that identified five different motives. One purpose of this study was to develop more items for several of those subscales with the hope of identifying six items for each of the five dimensions. Thus, 19 additional items were added to the original 24. Students were asked to rate on a Likert-type scale, from exactly like me (5) to not at all like me (1) how each of the statements reflected their own reasons for talking to their instructors. The 43 reasons students gave for communicating with their instructors were factor analyzed to identify the underlying factors. A principal component analysis with varimax rotation resulted in five factors with eigenvalues over 1.0. The five factors represented the five motives identified in the earlier study. The six items with the highest factor loadings for each factor were maintained. A factor analysis of these 30 items produced a five factor solution, six

items per factor. Factor One was labeled Relate (M = 2.24, SD = .86, α = .90). Factor Two was labeled Functional (M = 3.74, SD = .84, α = .87). Factor Three was labeled Sycophancy (M = 2.20, SD = .97, α = .89). Factor Four was labeled Excuse (M = 2.60, SD = 1.07, α = .89). Factor Five was labeled Participation (M = 2.51, SD = .94, α = .86). The factor loadings are given in Table 1.

Table 1 about here

Affective learning was measured using Mottet and Richmond's (in press) Affective Learning Measure. This measure, which is a revised version of McCroskey's (1966) original instrument and later used by Andersen (1979), reflects the total domain of affective learning as posited by Krathwohl et al. (1964). The revised measure consists of ten affect constructs, each including four, seven-step bipolar scales. This measure includes three sub-scales including course affect, instructor affect, and selectivity. The means, standard deviations, and coefficient alphas for the subscales were: course affect (M = 4.61, SD = 1.53, α = .97), teacher affect (M = 5.10, SD = 1.79, α = .96), and selectivity (M = 5.82, SD = 1.16, α = .91).

Similar to other studies examining learning, cognitive learning was measured using one item. Students were asked to rate from zero to nine how much they had learned in the class immediately preceding the current class. The mean score for this item was 5.97 (SD = 1.93).

Results

Both research questions were investigated using two-tailed Pearson correlations. The correlations between the five motives with affective and cognitive learning are given in Table 2.

Table 2 about here

Research Question One was interested in the relationship between reasons for talking with instructors and affective learning. Course affect was significantly related to the motives of relate ($r = .21$, $p < .01$), functional ($r = .23$, $p < .01$), and participation ($r = .24$, $p < .01$). Teacher affect was significantly related to the motives of relate ($r = .17$, $p < .01$) and functional ($r = .15$, $p < .01$). Selectivity was not significantly related to any of the five motives.

Research Question Two was interested in the relationship between reasons for talking with instructors and cognitive learning. Cognitive learning was significantly related to the motives of relate ($r = .18$, $p < .01$), functional ($r = .24$, $p < .01$), and participation ($r = .16$, $p < .01$).

Discussion

The primary purpose of this investigation was to examine the relationship between student motivation to communicate with their instructors and their reports of their affective and cognitive learning. The secondary purpose of this study was to establish reliability and validity of the Student Communication Motives Scale (SCMS) as developed by Martin et al. (1999). Generally, it was found that (a) relationships exist between particular student motives for communicating and student learning and (b) the SCMS can be considered a reliable and valid measure.

Three conclusions can be drawn regarding the primary purpose of this investigation. The first is that students who report higher amounts of affect toward the course, as well as higher amounts of perceived cognitive learning, report being motivated to communicate with their instructors for reasons to relate, for functional reasons, and to participate. On the surface, this finding is not altogether surprising. When students report communicating with their instructors in order to better understand the course and its requirements, students report learning more in class.

Previous research has established that a relationship exists between student learning and instructor self-disclosure (Sorensen, 1989), instructor clarity (Sidelinger & McCroskey, 1997), instructor verbal receptivity (Robinson, 1993), instructor effectiveness (Gorham & Zakahi, 1990), and instructor verbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988). However, these previous studies, among others, have examined student perceptions of instructor behaviors rather than their own behaviors. In this case, students who are motivated to communicate with their instructors report that they learn more about the teacher, course content and expectations are clarified, and they appear involved in classroom interaction. Perhaps by being proactive in their communication with their instructors, students feel more secure in their orientation toward the class and subsequently report higher levels of learning.

Moreover, students who are motivated to communicate in order to relate and participate report higher levels of affect toward the instructor. What this finding suggests is that when students learn more about their instructor, they feel compelled to communicate in return. It is no secret that instructors talk about themselves, their families, their feelings, and their ideas in class (Downs, Javidi, & Nussbaum, 1988; Javidi, Downs, & Nussbaum, 1988; Nussbaum, Comadena, & Holladay, 1987); however, students do differentiate between "good" and "bad" instructors on the basis of their self-disclosure (Sorensen, 1989). Perhaps students are motivated to engage in interaction when their instructors self-disclose, which leads to a greater amount of affect experienced toward the instructor.

Along the same lines, students may experience higher levels of solidarity and homophily when they are motivated to communicate with their instructors. Future research needs to explore this possibility. For example, Frymier and Houser (1998) found that when instructors are perceived to engage in a variety of functional communication skills--skills normally associated

with friendship (Burleson & Samter, 1990, 1996; Samter & Burleson, 1990; Westmyer & Myers, 1996)--students not only report higher amounts of learning, but they rate instructors use of functional communication skills as being important. For some students, the instructor-student relationship may parallel other forms of intimate relationships, such as friendships. When students discover confirming, prosocial characteristics in their instructors, they may naturally report a higher affinity with them. And as Myers and Horvath (1997) discovered, students report higher amounts of affective learning when teachers engage in human behaviors (i.e., being open, friendly, relaxed) and higher amounts of cognitive learning when teachers engage in both human and authority behaviors (i.e., being precise, dominant).

The second conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that student selectivity is not related in any way with their motivation to communicate with their instructors. That is, student attendance and/or paying attention in class may not be indicative of either their desire or need to communicate with their instructors. And for some students, selectivity may be independent of their need to communicate. It is possible to do well for instance, in some college courses without ever having to attend class or engage in class discussion. At the same time, student communication characteristics (e.g., communication competence, communication apprehension) may affect their motivation to communicate with their instructors, but not affect their attendance record or any concerted effort to pay attention in class. In any case, student selectivity is not related to their motivation to communicate with their instructors. Although this finding may appear disheartening, it may explain why some students choose not to communicate with their instructors. This finding may also be indicative of the "student as consumer" metaphor that is currently pervasive within higher education (McMillan & Cheney, 1996). That is, students who

are paying for their educations may deem it is their right not to communicate with their instructors as well as affecting their decision whether to attend class and/or pay attention.

The third conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that the students' motives of sycophancy and excuse making were not significantly related with their perceptions of affective and cognitive learning. What this finding implies is that students who engage in the use of these motives may be well aware that sycophancy and excuse making are detractions from the learning experience. Simonds (1997) found that students engage in particular behaviors that are destructive to the classroom environment, which she termed "challenge behavior." Perhaps a relationship exists between student motivation to communicate with their instructor and their tendency to engage in challenge behavior. This contention echoes the finding advanced by Martin et al. (1998), who found that students who communicate for control tend to communicate more for excuse making and sycophancy. In addition, while the other three motives (i.e., relate, functional, participate) appear to be identified with prosocial classroom behaviors, these two motives deal with (a) communication that takes place to save face and (b) communication intended to improve one's image. Neither of these motives appear to directly reflect on learning, either positively or negatively. Other classroom factors, such as attendance and final grade, might be more likely to be related to the motives of sycophancy and excuse making rather than the self-report measures of affective and cognitive learning. Furthermore, it is possible that when students are motivated to communicate with their instructors for purposes of excuse making and sycophancy, they may not be concerned with learning in the first place.

The secondary purpose of this investigation was to examine the reliability and validity of the SCMS. To accomplish this task, 19 items were added to the original 24 items used in the previous version (Martin et al., 1999). Similar to the initial study, five factors emerged: relate,

functional, sycophancy, excuse, and participation, but each factor now has six items. Items generally remained the same for four of the five factors; the items in the relational and functional subscales are the same items as reported by Martin et al. (1999); the participation and the excuse-making subscales now each have six items. Moreover, reliabilities for each of the five factors ranged from .86 to .90, which is parallel to the reliabilities reported by Martin et al. (1999).

The six items in the sycophancy subscale are all new, and arguably, a truer representation of sycophancy. In the original scale, items in the sycophancy scale included "to ear brownie points" and to "brown nose." While these items reflect the idea of sycophancy, students might also have found these responses to be socially desirable. The six current items are: to pretend I'm interested in the course, to give the instructor the impression that I like him/her, to give the impression that I think the instructor is an effective teacher, to give the impression that I'm learning a lot from the instructor, to give the impression that I'm interested in the course content, and to get special permission/privileges not granted to all students. These items appear to have greater face validity for the motive of sycophancy.

Future research may consider whether student motivation to communicate plays a role in instructor-student out-of-class (OOC) interaction. Although researchers have found that instructor-student OOC interaction does not occur on a frequent basis, it appears as if it is the same students who regularly interact with instructors in the classroom (Fusani, 1994; Nadler & Nadler, 1995, 1997). Thus, it might prove interesting to examine the motivation that underlies such interaction. At the same time, classroom contextual and structural variables may also affect student motivation to communicate with their instructors. Gorham and Christophel (1992) reported that students indicate higher levels of motivation when they have the opportunity to participate in class discussion and if they receive feedback from their instructors. Perhaps

instructor communication behaviors, or their communicator style, are related to student motivation to communicate.

In sum, the results of this study indicate that not only are students motivated to communicate with their instructors, but that their motivation is related to perceptions of their affective and cognitive learning. Through interaction with their instructors, it is not only possible for students to increase their own learning, but instructors may also heighten student participation in classroom instruction by recognizing that students are motivated to communicate in order to relate, to participate, or to gain needed information. At the same time, the results indicate that students are motivated to communicate with their instructors for reasons other than simply asking questions. Moreover, the establishment of the SCMS now makes it possible to gain the student perspective on student-instructor interaction by introducing a reliable, valid instrument that measures student motivation to communicate with their instructors.

References

Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.). Communication Yearbook 3 (pp. 543-559). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Andersen, J. F., Norton, R. W., & Nussbaum, J. F. (1981). Three investigations exploring relationships between perceived teacher communication behaviors and student learning. Communication Education, 30, 377-392.

Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (1995a). Communication motives of assertive and responsive communicators. Communication Research Reports, 12, 186-191.

Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (1995b). The effects of communication motives, interaction involvement, and loneliness on satisfaction: A model of small groups. Small Group Research, 26, 118-137.

Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (1995c). Why employees talk to coworkers and superiors: Motives, gender, and organizational satisfaction. Journal of Business Communication, 32, 249-266.

Bloom, B. S. (1956). Taxonomy of education objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive domain. New York: McKay.

Booth-Butterfield, S., Mosher, N., & Mollish, D. (1992). Teacher immediacy and student involvement: A dual process analysis. Communication Research Reports, 9, 13-21.

Burleson, B. R., & Samter, W. (1990). Effects of cognitive complexity on the perceived importance of communication skills in friends. Communication Research, 17, 165-182.

Burleson, B. R., & Samter, W. (1996). Similarity in the communication skills of young adults: Foundations of attraction, friendship, and relationship satisfaction. Communication Reports, 9, 127-139.

Christensen, L. J., & Menzel, K. E. (1998). The linear relationship between student reports of teacher immediacy behaviors and perceptions of state motivation, and of cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning. Communication Education, 47, 82-90.

Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationship among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. Communication Education, 37, 323-340.

Christophel, D. M., & Gorham, J. (1995). A test-retest analysis of student motivation, teacher immediacy, and perceived sources of motivation and demotivation in college classes. Communication Education, 44, 292-306.

Comstock, J., Rowell, E., & Bowers, J. W. (1995). Food for thought: Teacher nonverbal immediacy, student learning and curvilinearity. Communication Education, 44, 251-266.

Cooper, P. J., Stewart, L. P., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1982). Relationship with instructor and other variables influencing student evaluations of instruction. Communication Quarterly, 30, 308-315.

Darling, A. L. (1989). Signaling non-comprehensions in the classroom: Toward a descriptive theory. Communication Education, 38, 34-40.

Downs, V. C., Javidi, M., & Nussbaum, J. F. (1988). An analysis of teachers' verbal communication within the college classroom: Use of humor, self-disclosure, and narratives. Communication Education, 37, 127-141.

Frymier, A. B. (1994). A model of immediacy in the classroom. Communication Quarterly, 42, 133-144.

Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (1997, Nov.). The role of communication in learning: Does talking make you learn more? Paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention, Chicago.

Frymier, A. B., & Houser, M. L. (1998). Does making content relevant make a difference in learning? Communication Research Reports, 15, 121-129.

Frymier, A. B., Shulman, G. M., & Houser, M. (1996). The development of a learner empowerment measure. Communication Education, 45, 181-199.

Fusani, D. S. (1994). "Extra-class" communication: Frequency, immediacy, self-disclosure, and satisfaction in student-faculty interaction outside the classroom. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 22, 232-255.

Good, T. L. (1981). Teacher expectations and student perceptions: A decade of research. Educational Leadership, 38, 415-423.

Good, T. L., Slavings, R. L., Hard, K. H., & Emerson, H. (1987). Student passivity: A study of question asking in K-12 classroom. Sociology of Education, 60, 181-199.

Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. Communication Education, 37, 40-53.

Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. M. (1992). Students' perceptions of teacher behaviors as motivating and demotivating factors in college classes. Communication Quarterly, 40, 239-252.

Gorham, J., & Millette, D. M. (1997). A comparative analysis of teacher and student perceptions of sources of motivation and demotivation in college classes. Communication Education, 46, 245-261.

Gorham, J., & Zakahi, W. R. (1990). A comparison of teacher and student perceptions of immediacy and learning: Monitoring process and product. Communication Education, 39, 354-368.

Graham, E. E., Barbato, C. A., & Perse, E. M. (1993). The interpersonal communication motives model. Communication Quarterly, 41, 172-186.

Hosman, L. A. (1991). The relationship among need for privacy, loneliness, conversational sensitivity, and interpersonal communication motives. Communication Reports, 4, 73-80.

Hurt, H. T., Scott, M. D., & McCroskey, J. C. (1978). Communication in the classroom. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Javidi, M. N., Downs, V. C., & Nussbaum, J. F. (1988). Comparative analysis of teachers' use of style behaviors at higher and secondary educational levels. Communication Education, 37, 278-288.

Javidi, M., Jordan, W. J., & Carlone, D. (1994). Situational influence on the selection or avoidance of compliance-gaining strategies: A test of motivation to communicate. Communication Research Reports, 11, 127-134.

Kearney, P. (1994). Affective learning. In R. B. Rubin, P. Palmgreen, & H. E. Sypher (Eds.), Communication research measures: A sourcebook (pp. 81-85). New York: Guilford Press.

Kendrick, W. L. (1987). Receiver clarifying in response to problems of understanding. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Spokane.

Kendrick, W. L., & Darling, A. L. (1990). Problems of understanding in classrooms: Students' use of clarifying tactics. Communication Education, 39, 15-29.

Kondo, D. S. (1994). A comparative analysis of interpersonal communication motives between high and low communication apprehensives. Communication Research Reports, 11, 53-58.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook II: Affective domain. New York: McKay.

Martin, M. M., & Anderson, C. M. (1995). The father-young adult child relationship: Interpersonal motives, self-disclosure, and satisfaction. Communication Quarterly, 43, 119-130.

Martin, M. M., & Anderson, C. M. (1998, April). Interpersonal communication motives in small groups. Paper presented at the Eastern Communication Association Convention, Saratoga Springs, NY.

Martin, M. M., Myers, S. A., & Mottet, T. P. (1998, Nov.). Students' motives for communicating with their instructors. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention, New York.

Martin, M. M., Myers, S. A., & Mottet, T. P. (1999). Students' motives for communicating with their instructors. Communication Education, 48, 155-164.

Martin, M. M., & Rubin, R. B. (1998). The affinity-seeking process in initial interactions. Southern Communication Journal, 63, 131-143.

McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Experimental studies of the effects of ethos and evidence in persuasive communication. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Pennsylvania State University.

Mottet, T. P. (1998). Interactive television instructors' perceptions of students' nonverbal responsiveness and effects on distance teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.

Mottet, T. P., & Richmond, V. P. (in press). Re-examining affective learning measurement. Communication Research Reports.

Myers, S. A. (1997, Nov.). Student interpersonal communication motives and classroom apprehension. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention, Chicago.

Myers, S. A., & Horvath, C. W. (1997). A further examination of teacher communicator style and college student learning. Journal of the Illinois Speech & Theatre Association, 18, 37-48.

Myers, S. A., Zhong, M., & Mitchell, W. (1995). The use of interpersonal communication motives in conflict resolution among romantic partners. Ohio Speech Journal, 33, 1-21.

Nadler, M. K., & Nadler, L. B. (1995, Nov.). The roles of empathy, credibility, and sex in out of class communication between faculty and students. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, San Antonio.

Nadler, M. K., & Nadler, L. B. (1997, Nov.). The roles of empathy, relational topoi, and instructor sex in out of class communication between faculty and students: A faculty perspective. Paper presented at the National Communication Association Convention, Chicago.

Nussbaum, J. F. (1992). Effective teacher behaviors. Communication Education, 41, 167-180.

Nussbaum, J. F., Comadena, M. E., & Holladay, S. J. (1987). Classroom verbal behavior of highly effective teachers. Journal of Thought, 22, 73-80.

Nussbaum, J. F., & Scott, M. D. (1979). Instructor communication behaviors and their relationships to classroom learning. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 3. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction-International Communication Association.

Nussbaum, J. F., & Scott, M. D. (1980). Student learning as a relational outcome of teacher-student interaction. Communication Yearbook, 4, 553-564.

Pearson, J. C., & West, R. (1991). An initial investigation of the effects of gender on student questions in the classroom: Developing a descriptive base. Communication Education, 40, 22-32.

Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. Communication Education, 39, 181-195.

Richmond, V. P., & Gorham, J. (1998). Communication, learning, and affect in instruction. Action, MA: Tapestry Press.

Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1987). The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. Communication Yearbook, 10, 574-590.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1992). Power in the classroom: Communication, control, and concern. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1986). Power in the classroom VII: Linking behavior alteration techniques to cognitive learning. Communication Education, 36, 1-12.

Robinson, R. Y. (1993). The usefulness of the verbal receptivity measure in instructional communication research. Communication Quarterly, 41, 292-298.

Rodriguez, J. I., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1996). Clarifying the relationship between teacher nonverbal immediacy and student cognitive learning: Affective learning as the central causal mediator. Communication Education, 45, 293-305.

Rubin, A. M. (1993). The effect of locus of control on communication motivation, anxiety, and satisfaction. Communication Quarterly, 41, 161-171.

Rubin, R. B., & Martin, M. M. (1994). Development of a measure of interpersonal communication competence. Communication Research Reports, 11, 33-44.

Rubin, R. B., & Martin, M. M. (1998). Interpersonal communication motives. In J. C. McCroskey, J. A. Daly, M. M. Martin, & M. J. Beatty (Eds.), Communication and personality: Trait perspectives (pp. 287-308). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Rubin, R. B., Perse, E. M., & Barbato, C. A. (1988). Conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication motives. Human Communication Research, 14, 602-628.

Samter, W., & Burleson, B. R. (1990). Evaluations of communication skills as predictors of peer acceptance in a group living situation. Communication Studies, 41, 317-325.

Schutz, W. C. (1966). The interpersonal underworld. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Paradigms and research programs in the study of teaching: A contemporary perspective. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 3-36). New York: MacMillan.

Sidelinger, R. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). Correlates of teacher clarity in the college classroom. Communication Research Reports, 14, 1-10.

Simonds, C. J. (1997). Challenge behavior in the classroom. Communication Research Reports, 14, 481-492.

Sorensen, G. (1989). The relationships among teachers' self-disclosive statements, students' perceptions, and affective learning. Communication Education, 38, 259-276.

van der Meij, H. (1989). Constraints on question asking in classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80, 401-405.

West, R., & Pearson, J. C. (1994). Antecedent and consequent conditions of student questioning: An analysis of classroom disclosure across the university. Communication Education, 43, 299-311.

Westmyer, S. A., & Myers, S. A. (1996). Communication skills and social support across friendship levels. Communication Research Reports, 13, 191-197.

Wilson, R. C., Woods, L., & Gaff, J. G. (1974). Social-psychological accessibility and faculty-student interaction beyond the classroom. Sociology of Education, 47, 74-92.

Factor Loadings	I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.
1. to learn about him/her personally	.81	.00	.20	.06	.21
1. so we can develop a friendship	.80	.10	.27	.07	.15
1. to build a personal relationship	.78	.07	.14	.09	.13
1. to learn more about the teacher personally	.80	.08	.19	.08	.21
1. because I find him/her interesting	.71	.26	.17	.00	.21
1. because we share common interests	.73	.11	.04	.09	.13
2. to clarify the material	-.01	.82	.10	-.05	.04
2. to get assistance on the assignments/exams	.06	.82	.03	.12	.04
2. to learn how I can improve in the class	.13	.76	.04	.14	.15
2. to ask questions about the material	.01	.86	.04	.00	.09
2. to get academic advice	.29	.70	.03	.11	.10
2. to get more information on the requirements of the course	.12	.63	-.03	.17	.18
3. to pretend I'm interested in the course	.08	.04	.70	.27	.13
3. to give the instructor the impression that I like him/her	.30	.03	.80	.11	.10
3. to give the impression that I think the instructor is an effective teacher	.28	.05	.81	.01	.17
3. to give the impression that I'm learning a lot from the instructor	.27	.14	.80	.01	.24
3. to give the impression that I'm interested in the course content	.20	.16	.75	.02	.29
3. to get special permission/privileges not granted to all students	.02	-.16	.62	.27	.13

4. to explain why work is late	.04	.04	.03	.86	.04
4. to explain absences	.09	.11	.05	.87	.07
4. to explain why I do not have my work done	.14	.02	.05	.89	.06
4. to challenge a grade I received	.02	.21	.09	.50	.26
4.to explain why my work does not meet the instructor's expectations	.07	.04	.28	.76	.09
4. to explain the quality of my work	.03	.16	.20	.70	.27
5. to appear involved in class	.10	.33	.38	.20	.51
5. because my input is vital for class discussion	.32	.09	.10	.12	.73
5. to demonstrate I understand the material	.17	.20	.17	.19	.73
5. to demonstrate my intelligence	.08	.14	.22	.12	.75
5. because my classmates value my contribution to class discussions	.32	-.07	.21	.08	.71
5. because my instructor values class participation	.34	.24	.15	.14	.63

Note. Factor 1 = relational. Factor 2 = functional. Factor 3 = sycophancy. Factor 4 = excuse-making. Factor 5 = participation.

Table 2

Correlations with Students' Motives for Communicating with Their Instructors

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Relate	(.90)	.29	.55	.23	.47
2. Functional	.29	(.87)	.39	.25	.18
3. Participation	.55	.39	(.86)	.40	.54
4. Excuse	.23	.25	.40	(.89)	.32
5. Sycophancy	.47	.18	.54	.32	(.89)
Course Affect	.21	.23	.24	.05	-.05
Teacher Affect	.17	.15	.08	.01	.07
Selectivity	.07	.08	.09	-.07	-.07
Cognitive Learning	.18	.24	.16	.00	.06

Note 1. Correlations of .15 or higher are significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Note 2. Reliabilities are in the parentheses for the five motives for talking to instructors.